IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.R.No. 5530 of 2006
Date of decision : 19.10.2006.

Lakshmi

.....Petitioner.

Versus

Sukhpal.

.....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD K. SHARMA

Present : Mr.J.S. Hooda,Advocate
for the petitioner.

****

VINOD K. SHARMA,J.(ORAL)

The present revision petition has been filed against the order dated 12.8.2006 vide which the learned lower appellate Court has been pleased to grant the injunction in favour of the plaintiff respondent by holding that he is owner and allottee of plot No. 48/11.

The ownership of the said plot has not been disputed. The petitioner herein claimed that the plaintiff-respondent was not in possession and in fact one Bal Kishan was in possession of the property who has not been impleaded as a party and, therefore, the learned court below could not have granted injunction.

I have gone through the said order and find that the learned Court below has come to the conclusion that it is a vacant plot and

possession goes with ownership and accordingly granted injunction in favour of the plaintiff. The petitioner claims no interest in the said plot, therefore, there is no error or illegality in the order which may call for interference by this Court.

Dismissed.

October 19,2006 **(VINOD K. SHARMA)**
'sp' **JUDGE**